

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 are pending in this application and claims 1-8 and 11-14 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita, (U.S. 6,330,574), in view of Dean et al. (U.S. 2002/0152244), and further in view of Martin et al., “WAP Binary XML Content Format”, W3C Note, June 24, 1999, pgs. 1-22 (hereinafter “W3C-A”), in further view of James Clark, “Associating Stylesheets with XML Documents”, W3C Proposed Recommendation, April 28, 1999, pgs. 1-4 (hereinafter “W3C-B”).

The present invention is a system and method for code processing of document data. Processing begins by encoding a document data written in an extensible text format description language of code data using a translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format. The translation table defines link information of other translation tables corresponding to the extended document data. Also, the translation table defines a code length and a code assigned to items of the link information, an element name, an element value of the element name, an attribute name designated in the element name, an attribute value of the attribute name. Further, the translation table defines a code length and a code assigned for designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name.

Murashita describes compression and decompression of tags in a markup document. A tag code table is created based upon a tag extracted by a tag extracting unit. The Examiner asserts that the tag code table is equivalent to the translation table of the present invention. The Examiner admits that tag code table of Murashita is not written in a description language of an extensible text format.

Dean et al. describes using lookup tables encoded as XML files. These lookup tables store translations of element names and help strings as well as labels.

W3C-A describes Wireless Application Protocol (WAP) binary Extensible Markup Language (XML) content format. This submission defines a compact binary representation of XML so as to reduce the transmission size of XML documents to facilitate the operation of wireless devices. The Examiner asserts that code pages discussed in W3C are equivalent to the translation tables of the present invention.

W3C-B describes a stylesheet to be associated with an XML document. In the text of the article it describes earlier versions of HTTP allowed stylesheets to be associated with XML documents by means of a link header.

In item 6 on pages 8-9 the Examiner responds to our arguments stated in our amendment filed on January 26, 2006. The Examiner asserts that W3C-B meets that limitation that “defining link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure”. The question that must be asked is can the stylesheets described in W3C-B be interpreted as being

equivalent to the code-translation tables of the present invention. As indicated on page 8 , lines 18-23 of the specification,

“Also, a translation table 11 defines link information with respect to a plurality of translation tables 110 and 111 corresponding to the extended document data. Thereby, the document data 12 of XML format is encoded by an encoding unit 10 to a code data based on the translation table 11.”

The independent claims have been amended to further indicate that defining link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure utilized in the encoding and decoding of said document data.

Applicants have reviewed newly cited reference W3C-B and believes that W3C-B never teaches “each of the first and second code-translation tables defines link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure (utilized in the encoding and decoding of said document data)” as recited in claims 1, 5 and 13.

Stylesheet in W3C-B is quite different from the code translation table according to the present invention. The stylesheet is a decoration table corresponding to the contents. That is, there is no stylesheet for HTML format (tag set) but is stylesheet for “***.html”. This means that the stylesheet needs to be re-created depending upon the contents. Contrary to this, code translation table according to the present invention is an encoding table corresponding to namespace (data format, tag set). That is, the code translation table is an encoding table for HTML format not depending upon the contents. This means that the code translation table needs not to be re-created depending upon the contents.

W3C-B merely discloses link information between the document and stylesheet for defining decoration of the document, not link information between code translation tables as the present invention recited in claims 1, 5 and 13. According to the present invention, the code translation tables as the present invention, the code translation table is linked to the document by namespace (see Fig. 6 and page 12, lines 6-17). Therefore, according to the present invention, when the document is extended, a plurality of code translation tables are coupled by only defining link information in reference to the namespaces without re-creating the document itself nor the code translation table. Contrary to this, according to W3C-B, because the link information is described in the document, when additional decoration is requested, not only re-created document but also another stylesheet are necessary to provide. Thus, meanings and functions of the link information disclosed in W3C-B are quite different from that of the present invention.

Further, the link information according to the present invention is utilized in the encoding and decoding of the document, whereas the link information according to W3C-B is utilized in decoration of the document. Therefore, independent claims 1, 5 and 13 patentably distinguish over the prior art relied upon by reciting, as exemplified by claim 1,

“A computer implemented method executable by computers and embedded in a computer readable media for code processing of document data comprising the steps of: encoding, at a sending side, a document data written in a description language of an extensible text format to a code data containing logical structure of elements, based on a first code-translation table written in a description language of an extensible text format; transmitting said code data from the sending side to a receiving side; and decoding, at the receiving side, said code data to the document data based on a second code-translation table written in the description language of the extensible text format, each of said first and second code-translation tables defining a code length and a code assigned to items of an element name, an variable-

declaration data type of an element value for said element name, an attribute name designated in said element name; and an variable-declaration data type of an attribute value for said attribute name, based on logical structure of elements, defining a code length and a code assigned to designate parentage structure between one element name and other element name, and defining link information about other code-translation tables corresponding to extended document structure utilized in the encoding and decoding of said document data." (Emphasis Added)

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murashita, (U.S. 6,330,574), in view of Dean et al. (U.S. 2002/0152244), and further in view of Martin et al., "WAP Binary XML Content Format", W3C Note, June 24, 1999, pgs. 1-22, in further view of James Clark, "Associating Stylesheets with XML Documents", W3C Proposed Recommendation, April 28, 1999, pgs. 1-4.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-8 and 11-14, as amended, are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is respectfully requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/nrp
Atty. Docket No. **011736**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE